DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 329 CE 038 216

TITLE	A Study of the Significant Factors That Affect the Job Placement Rates of Students Who Have Completed a HERO Program. Year 2 Report.
INSTITUTION	Instructional Development and Evaluation Associates, Inc., Berkeley, Mich.
SPONS AGENCY	Michigan State Dept. of Education, Lansing. Vocational-Technical Education Service.
PUB DATE	May 82
NOTE	89p.; For related documents, see CE 038 215-217.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; *Child Care Occupations; *Clothing; Educational Strategies; *Food Service; Influences; *Job Placement; Job Training; Models; *Occupational Home Economics; *Outcomes of Education; Pilot Projects; Program Content; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Research Methodology; State Surveys; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Food Production; *Home Economics Related Occupations; Michigan

ABSTRACT

A three-year study examined the significant factors that affect the job placement rates of students completing a Home Economics Related Occupations (HERO) program. Other purposes of the study were to develop and pilot test a model that could be used to determine factors related to student placement in a variety of vocational education programs and to provide a thorough description of the HERO programs under study. During the second year of the study, researchers visited 145 program sites throughout Michigan that had HERO programs in child care; food management, production, and services; and clothing management, production, and services. Data from each of the site visits were organized first into individual case studies and were then analyzed collectively to ascertain factors associated with student job placement rates. While many of the findings were specific to only one of these programs, four findings applied across all three programs. First, program assessment procedures should be used for program evaluation and should be enacted at least once each year. In addition, multiple resources should be used in curriculum development, and promotional activities should be targeted to guidance counselors. Finally, student follow-up should be used for program modification. (A list of programmatic recommendations are appended.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED240329

A Study of the Significant Factors that Affect the Job Placement Rates of Students Who Have Completed a HERO Program

Year 2 Report

May, 1982

Submitted by:

Instructional Development and Evaluation Associates, Inc.
Berkley, Michigan

CE 038 216

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Michigan Dept of Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Foreword

This study was conducted by Instructional Development and Evaluation Associates, Inc. under contract with the Michigan Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Education Service. Instructional Development and Evaluation Associates, Inc. would like to thank Dr. Barbara Atkins, Paul Novak, and the HERO Study Advisory Committee for their assistance throughout this project. Their assistance was invaluable during this project.

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	Project Background	1
II.	Methodology	4
III.	Selection and Role of the Advisory Committee	6
IV.	Identification of Sites to be Visited	8
V.	Interview Process	9
VI.	Case Study Summarizations	10
VII.	Findings	21
VIII.	Conclusions	38
IX.	Recommendations	46
X.	Year 3 Activities	47
	Appendices	48

A. List of Programs Visited
B. Letter Sent to Site Directors
C. Programmatic Recommendations

Project Background

The primary purpose of this study was to identify significant factors that affect the job placement rates of students completing a Home Economics Related Occupations (HERO) Program. A second purpose of this study was to develop and pilot a model which could be used to determine factors related to student placement in a variety of vocational education programs. While the data collection model is generalizeable to other programs, the findings are limited to those programs under study. It is reasonable to believe after a larger sample of programs are studied more general variables will be identified which affect job placement rates. A third purpose of the study was to provide summary descriptions of the HERO Programs under study.

A total of five program types comprise the HERO Program offerings. These program types and a brief description of each follows:

1. Child Care Services - instruction emphasizes the competencies essential for employment in child care related fields. The instruction centers around the needs and care of young children.

2. Clothing Management/Production and Services - instruction emphasizes the competencies essential for employment in the clothing and textile industries.

3. Food Management Production and Services - instruction emphasizes the competencies needed for various employment situations related to institutional and commercial food services.

4. Home Furnishings, Equipment and Services - instruction emphasizes the competencies essential for various kinds of employment related to home furnishings, equipment and related services.

5. Institutional Home Management and Supporting Services - instruction emphasizes the necessary competencies required for various kinds of employment related to insitutional housekeeping, hotel/motel housekeeping as well as private home care needs.

The emphasis of the research study this year was in three of these five HERO Programs: Child Care, Food Management Production and Services, and Clothing Management/Production and Services. The remaining two programs (Home Furnishings, Equipment and Services, and Institutional Home Management) were the focus of this study during Year 1 of the project. This allowed for a piloting of the research process on a smaller basis as these two programs have the smallest number of operating sites.

To obtain the data for this study, staff from Instructional Development and Evaluation Associates, Inc. visited 145 different programs around the state of Michigan. The sites visited were those which offered either a Child Care, Food Management Production and Services, or Clothing Management/Production and Services or more than 1 of the programs. A complete list of the programs visited is contained in Appendix A.

Two major analytical segments resulted from the activities of this research study. Each segment added a different dimension of information used in the determination of significant factors impacting the placement rates of students in the HERO Programs. The first segment consisted of the development of case study descriptions for each of the 145 programs visited. The purpose of these case studies was to provide a summary description of each program visited. The second segment was an analysis of the information collected during each site visit to ascertain factors associated with the placement rates of students.

As a result of the activities described a set of recommendations was developed.

The case studies developed as a result of the on-site visitations are presented in a separate document titled "HERO Study Report: Case Studies and Summarizations". This report is available through the Vocational Education Technical Service (VTES) office.

Methodology

Development of the Survey Instruments

In order to develop the appropriate instrumentation, it was necessary to determine research questions that identified the delivery system of each of the HERO Programs as well as those factors of each HERO Program that enhanced or reduced the program graduates' ability to obtain employment within the area of the program for the research questions, resulting instrumentation, and analysis involved a number of steps. Briefly, these steps were:

1. Review of instrumentation used in year 1 of the study.
2. Modification of year 1 instrumentation.
3. Presentation of reviewed instrument drafts to advisory committee.
4. Modification of instruments based on comments of advisory committee.
5. Development and review of program focus questions.
6. Pilot test of instrument.
7. Finalization of instruments.

As indicated, the instrument development process was based largely on the work conducted during the first project year. The initial instrument work for the second project year focussed upon revising the instrumentation used during year 1 to make the instrumentation more efficient and less time consuming. Once the initial drafts of the new instruments were developed, a meeting of the advisory committee was held to review these instruments. The advisory committee made several recommendations which were used in the modification of the final instrument versions. The

major change which occurred based upon the input from the advisory committee was the addition of a program specific survey for each of the three programs under study. This is reflected in Step 5 of the instrument development process listed on the previous page.

In order to develop the program focus instruments, staff from Instructional Development and Evaluation Associates, Inc. contacted several key individuals within each of the content areas to ascertain appropriate questions specific to that program. Based upon these interviews, program focus questionnaires were developed and reviewed with Dr. Barbara Atkins from the Michigan Department of Education. Based upon this review several changes were made to the program focus instruments.

Once all revisions to the instruments had been made, three pilot tests were conducted. Two pilot tests were conducted at the Athens High School in Troy, Michigan on November 12, 1981 and the third pilot test was conducted at Berkley High School on November 10, 1982. The purpose of these pilot tests was to identify any problems in the process used during the interviews as well as any modifications which might be needed in the instruments themselves. Based upon the results of the pilot test, final modifications were made to the instruments. The instruments were then submitted to Dr. Barbara Atkins for final approval.

Selection and Role of the Advisory Committee

An advisory committee for the 1981-82 project year was identified to provide expertise during the project. The advisory committee was comprised of both individuals who had previously served on the advisory committee as well as new members. Each individual was contacted by telephone, provided with a description of the second project year, the role of the committee, and asked if they would be willing to serve. A total of 13 individuals agreed to serve. These individuals are identified in Figure 1. As can be seen by an examination of these names, the members were individuals with practical experience in the field both at the local school and area vocational center level.

Two meetings were held during the second project year. The first meeting was on September 24, 1981 and the second on May 19, 1982. The purpose of the first meeting was to review the instrumentation. The purpose of the second meeting was to review the results of the 1982 project year.

Figure 1

HERO Advisory Board - 1982

Ms. Gloria Bourdon
Genesee Intermediate
School District
2413 W. Maple
Flint, MI 48507
767-4310 ext. 245

Ms. Betty Wallace
Mt. Pleasant High School
1155 S. Elizabeth
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48858
(517) 772-9452

Ms. Sharon Brittain
Lenawee Vocational
Center
2345 North Adrian Hwy.
Adrian, MI 49221
(517) 263-2108

Ms. Dixie Grow
East Lansing High
School
509 Burcham
East Lansing, MI 48823
(517) 332-2545

Ms. Diane Potts
Jackson Area Career
Center
6800 Browns Lake Road
Jackson, MI
(517) 787-2700

Dr. Bruce Grow
Michigan Department of
Education
P.O. Box 30009
Lansing, MI 48909
(517) 373-0600

Mr. Neil Sage
Northwest Oakland Vocational
Center
Box 38
Clarkston, MI 48016
625-5202

Ms. Barb Rupp
Calhoun Area Vocational
Center
475 E. Roosevelt
Battle Creek, MI 49017
(616) 968-2271

Dr. Marvin Oberlander
Mt. Pleasant Public
Schools
1155 S. Elizabeth
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48858
(517) 773-7961

Ms. Dolores Norman
5057 Woodward
Room 976
Detroit, MI 48202
494-1663

Identification of Sites to be Visited

As previously indicated, this year's study focused on three of the five HERO Program types; Child Care Services, Clothing Management/Production Services, and Food Management Production and Services. The 115 locations visited by the interview teams each had at least one of these three programs. Some of the sites had all three programs. The 115 sites comprised the entire statewide population. Appendix A provides a list of the locations visited and the date of each visitation.

Two steps occurred prior to each site visitation. The first step was a telephone call to the Vocational Director at each program site. The purpose of the telephone call was to provide an overview of the survey purpose, procedures, and to request permission to visit each program. In addition, the time for the visitation to the site was also established. Each vocational director was requested to arrange interviews with the placement director and program instructor. The telephone calls were followed-up with a letter reiterating the request and reconfirming the time and date of the visitation. A copy of this letter is provided in Appendix B. Follow-up phone calls were sometimes necessary to reconfirm the visitation data and time.

Interview Process

The interviews were conducted by individuals having expertise in the program areas to which they were assigned. Prior to the site visits, a half day training session was conducted to familiarize the interviewers with the project as well as with the instrument to be used. Mock interviews were conducted and interviewers were provided the opportunity to "run through" the interview process in order to determine any potential problems or questions they might encounter. Folders containing all necessary materials were prepared for each interviewer and then grouped for each program site. One interviewer was assigned to each program, resulting in one to three interviews at each site. The format of the interviewing process was as follows: The interviewer at a given site met first with the vocational director and followed by an interview with the placement director. Next, each interviewer met with the program instructor of the program. At the conclusion of the interview with the instructor, the interviewer requested a list of program graduates. If this information was not readily available, self-addressed envelopes were provided so that these names could be provided at a later data via the mail. These individuals were contacted by telephone from the offices of Instructional Development and Evaluation Associates, Inc.

In many instances, the interviewers noted that they were provided with tours of the facilities. It should also be noted that in several locations the interview schedule deviated from that listed. In these cases, the interviewer made whatever adjustments were necessary to complete the interviews.

Case Study Summarization

This section of the report provides a summary of the case study outlines developed by the on-site interviewers for each of the three program types studied. The case study outlines provided information in a number of areas including: program focus, program components, description of students in the program, description of the facility housing the program, and comments made by persons interviewed. The purpose of this section is to provide a summarization of these case studies. The summarizations are provided separately for each of the three program types under study.

HERO Child Care Program - OE Code 09.0201

General Description of the Program

Fifty-one (51) HERO Child Care Program sites were visited throughout Michigan. Eighteen (18) of these sites developed and maintained programs that encompass two school years. Twenty-six (26) other sites maintained one year programs. A minority of these sites require students to spend a year in a prerequisite child development course. Programs at seven sites offered the students the second year as an optional choice. Sometimes this was a co-op experience.

General Focus of the Programs

The general focus of the majority of the programs visited was to provide students with knowledge and experiences in child care and guidance and to provide students with skills necessary for working with children.

There were many commonalities in terms of specific program focus across the sites visited. All of the programs offered students learning opportunities with preschool children. Some of the sites visited also offered opportunities with infant, elementary school children, and special education children.

Program Components

Instructional methodology through which the various curriculum components were taught were very similar between sites. The "hands-on" approach occupied the largest portion of student time, whether it occured through work with an in-school nursery

(lab) or with an unpaid work experience at a day care or nursery facility in the community. Of the 51 program sites, 43 maintained regular public nursery schools within the school/vocational facility. The remaining eight sites placed students in on-the-job training situations in sites located throughout the community. Some of the sites that operated nursery schools, also sent students out into the community for additional training and exposure.

Facility Description

The locations in which Child Care programs operated ranged from unused elementary schools to converted chemistry laboratories or facilities originally designed for child care operations. Several of the facilities had built in observation rooms for use by students. These facilities were the newer facilities built specifically for the purpose of child care. The atmosphere within the classrooms observed were positive. Items such as large attractive bulletin boards, varied play equipment, and exercise apparatus were commonly observed. There was only one facility which did not have any lab space at all.

HERO Clothing Production Program - OE Code 09.0202

General Description of the Program

HERO Clothing Production Programs were visited at 11 locations. Five (5) of these programs were 3 year programs, while 5 were considered 2 year programs. The remaining program was considered a 1 year program. The majority of the instructor's stated that the main focus of their programs was to provide students with basic skills and knowledge in preparation for employment in the clothing industry.

Specific program goals were much the same from site to site. Emphasis at every location was placed on student acquisition of basic sewing techniques, alterations and clothing repair. Tailoring and flat pattern drafting were part of the offered program at four of the program sites. Five (5) sites had established an alteration shop within the confines of the classroom. This provided both paid and unpaid work experiences for the students. One site offered a dry cleaning service to students, teachers and the general community. Most of the programs included mass production techniques in their programs. Projects resulting from the mass production exercises were sold to raise money or were used as uniforms for the school. The ten sites which required two or more years of program participation offered a wider range of activities to the students including upholstery and drapery techniques.

Program Components

Most of the contact time spent with students occured in a lab situation. At the sites visited, between 60-80% of student

time is spent on lab activities. Other activities which served to enrich lab work include demonstrations, lectures, audio-visual presentations, field trips and fashion shows.

Skill checksheets were used so that instruction could be individualized according to each student's personal level of ability. Most of the sites offered individualized instruction, as student levels of ability varied a great deal even in the second year level and above.

Curriculum Development

Instructors played a significant role in the development of curriculum at all visitation sites. They frequently tapped their own experiences and expertise in order to make certain their curriculum was up-to-date. Several instructors kept up their contacts in the industrial field so as to insure that their program was meaningful to students.

Description of Student Populations

Over half of the programs visited had male program participants. Considering the total program enrollment of all eleven programs visited, males made up one-fourth of the total program enrollment.

The percentage of special needs students in the programs varied from site to site with five sites having 10% or less, four sites having 10-33%, one having 50% and one site not identifying any special needs students.

Facility Description

The facilities from site to site contained basically the same type of equipment, usually containing both commercial and domestic types of sewing machines. Several of the sites had industrial pressing equipment, one site had dry cleaning machine. All the programs appeared to have been located in facilities which were specifically designed for clothing curricula. There appeared to be adequate space for the program offerings in all sites, except one, where space appeared to be limited.

Comments Made by Individuals Interviewed

Vocational directors and department chairpersons, in general, felt that the job opportunities for students graduating from this program were positive. The exceptions to this were the programs that were not located near a large metropolitan area, here job opportunities for program graduates were viewed as limited.

Several sites nad no placement staff person available for interview. In these sites many of the instructors made their own job placement contacts and in some cases placed the students in jobs themselves.

Food Management and Production Services - OE Code 09.0203

General Description of the Program

Sites were visited which operated HERO Food Management and Production Service Programs. Programs at each site ranged from 1 year to 3 years in length. Some sites offered one year programs with an optional second year. The majority of the programs encompassed two academic years. Many of the twenty-two sites that offered a one year program had a required prerequisite course before entering Food Management and Production Services Program.

The major focus of most of the programs was to provide students with skills and experiences that could be used to gain employment in the food service industry. Specific program goals varied from site to site with seventeen sites offering students experiences in all areas of Food Production and Management, including the operation of a family-type restaurant, exclusive dining, institutional foods, and catering. However, the majority of the sites offered students experiences in the operation of a family-type restaurant with additional experiences in catering. Institutional foods was the focus at ten of the sites while two of the sites had students going out into the community for extensive on the job training as various sites for training in this area.

Program Components

Teaching strategies which were included in programming were virtually identical from site to site. Lab experiences constituted

for the greatest amount of student educational time. Three-fourths of the sites did catering outside the classroom. This was considered either "unpaid work experience" or was paid work experience. The catering often involved school events and was used as a vehicle for program promotion.

Like teaching strategies employed topical areas covered were basically identical at all sites. These areas included sanitation and safety, sales and service, food production, and management. Emphasis varied from site to site, however, some sites stressed sales and service along with food production, while another site stressed interpersonal communications, self-awareness and personal hygiene. Overall, the order in which topics were presented and the degree of responsibility which students were expected to take for topical mastery were the same at all locations: equipment led to food studies, which led to preparation, which led to serving, which led to cleaning which led to managing, all eighty five sites were involved in some type of food production, which led to the sale of food items. In most sites the sale of food items was done in an in-school restaurant, cafeteria or buffet arrangement, a place wherein students could develop and practice their skills. Many of these restaurant facilities were open to the public for at least portions of a few days every week. Primarily, beginning students utilized their restaurant participation for sheer practice, as compared to second year or third year students who generally were required to staff all job roles and manage the restaurant.

Curriculum Development

The majority of the visitation sites utilized the Michigan Department of Education Minimal Performance Objectives as a baseline for developing curriculum in food service programming. The majority of sites also relied heavily upon teacher experiences and expertise in curriculum development. Some informal involvement by the community food-related industries was also given for curriculum development.

Description of Student Population

Unlike the other HERO Programs which were visited, all but two of the programs had male students enrolled in the program. Twenty-four of the programs visited had an equal split along male/female in student population while nine programs visited had a larger number of male students than female students.

According to statements made by the instructors interviewed, the number of special needs students enrolled in the food service program varied from 12 sites which had less than 10% special needs students in their programs to 38 sites where half or more of their enrollment were special needs students.

Facility Description

Some of the sites visited had extensive facilities, which included commercial kitchens, fast-food snack bars, locker room facilities, dining rooms and separate classroom facilities. Other visitation sites were very limited in space and equipment provided for the program. However, the majority of programs

visited fell in between these two extremes and usually consisted of a fairly well equipped commercial kitchen and a separate dining room. The separate dining room was often used as a classroom when not in use for food service.

Comments Made by Individuals Interviewed

Vocational Director or Department Chairperson

Several of the vocational directors stated that they felt that the food service program offered exceptional occupational learning opportunities for all levels of students. Others felt that they needed to have better promotion in order to attract average and above average students.

Nearly all of the vocational directors interviewed expressed a positive attitude toward the foods service program. Many attributed the strength of the programs directly to the involvement and commitment of the instructors.

Placement Staff

There was no placement staff person to interview in several of the sites. This was because of several reasons, some sites had no monies available to fund the position. Others suffered from staff cutbacks and in some cases, no one was formally placing graduates of the program. Placement services for students in food services appear to involve program instructors to a high degree; most instructors either utilized their professional contacts to assist in placement of student, or actually found placement without significant placement center involvement.

At some sites, the placement staff offered students specialized workshops in employability skill development, apart from the program classes themselves. At other sites employability skills workshops were infused into programming by the instructor.

Findings

A. Results of Descriptive Analyses

Tables 1 through 5 contain a summary of various descriptive statistics concerning the information collected during the study. Table 1 concerns the number of sites visited during the 2 year study period. A total of 175 sites were visited, approximately 85% of all possible sites. Within the 5 program types visited, the percent of sites visited ranged from 75% to 100%.

Tables 2 through 4 provide information, on an individual site basis, concerning the 3 state placement definitions used: percent total employment, percent total related employment, and percent total education. In addition, the number of follow-up surveys upon which the percentages are based is reported. A general observation which may be made concerning these 3 tables is the wide variance in the reported placement rates across the 3 placement definitions. Finally, Table 5 provides summary information across all sites within a given program type. This table provides a basis for comparison across the 3 program types. These data should be interpreted in consideration of the nature of each program. The largest placement percentage for the total employment and total related employment were from the Food Management program. The largest percentage of continuing education placements were observed in the Clothing Management program.

B. Identification of Factors Influencing Placement Rates

This section of the report presents the results of the data analysis for the three programs. For each program three separate

analyses were conducted for the three placement definitions utilized. The three placement definitions used as the dependent measures were total employment, related placement, and educational placement. Total employment was comprised of all individuals employed either full or part time in related or unrelated areas. The related total placement was comprised of those individuals reporting they were employed in a related field on either a full or part time basis. Educational placement was comprised of those individuals who reported they were currently attending a post-secondary educational program. All placement data were obtained from the Michigan Department of Education Annual Follow-Up Data.

A three step process was utilized in the data analysis. The process was repeated a total of nine times, once each for the three placement definitions used for each of the three program types. The first step of the process was to calculate a Pearson Product Moment Correlation for each of the variables contained in the instruments to the dependent measure in question (one of the three placement rates). Based upon this analysis, all variables correlating significantly at the probability level of .1 were used to conduct a multiple regression. The multiple regression identified the key variables impacting the placement rate under study. The third and final process was to run a crosstabulation for the variables identified in the first step according to a high/low breakdown of the dependent measure under study. This analysis was used for two purposes. The first purpose was to further identify the nature of the interaction

found in the multiple regression process. Secondly, the crosstabulation served to identify key variables associated with either high or low placement which for statistical reasons were not included in the multiple regression process.

Based upon the three step process just discussed, a number of findings were identified. These findings are presented separately for each placement rate across all three program types. These results are presented in Tables 6-11. In the instance of the Clothing Management Program, it was found that the number of programs available for analysis was too small to conduct the regression analysis. Therefore, only crosstabulations are available for this program.

For those variables which were significantly correlated to placement but not maintained in the best fit regression equation, the researcher developed crosstabulations as a supplementary analysis. This was done since regression is based upon variable ordering and interactions. A variable could be significantly related to placement but not maintained within the regression. Tables 12-19 contain the results of this supplementary crosstabulations for the three programs.

When reviewing Tables 6-19 it is important to keep in mind that findings might be statistically significant and be limited in terms of its educational meaningfulness. This is true of several of the findings in these tables. Instructional Development and Evaluation Associates, Inc. during Year 3 of the project will contact many of the programs interviewed again to obtain indepth information concerning the variables presented in this

findings section. This will serve two purposes: to validate the statistical findings and to obtain more information about the specific activities associated with each variable such that cities can, if they desire, more easily and correctly institute the factors related to placement.

These findings were then transformed into a series of potential programmatic recommendations. These are presented in Appendix C.

Table 1

Summary of Site Visitations

Program Type	Year 1	Year 2	Total Visited	Number in State	Percent Visited
Institutional Home Management	5	0	5	5	100%
Home Furnishings	4	0	4	4	100%
Child Care	9	51	60	61	98%
Clothing Management	4	11	15	20	75%
Food Management	8	23	91	116	78%

Table 2

Child Care Program Placement Statistics

I.D.E.A. ID Number	Percent Total Employment	Percent Total Related Employment	Percent Total Education	Number of Respondents
1	66.7	16.7	11.1	18
2	3.5	0.0	13.8	29
3	0.0	0.0	50.0	2
4	37.5	25.0	18.8	16
5	40.0	0.0	20.0	5
6	66.7	44.4	22.2	9
7	40.0	20.0	6.7	15
8	55.6	16.7	61.1	18
9	70.0	50.0	40.0	10
10	62.5	6.3	62.5	16
11	77.8	29.6	37.0	27
12	46.4	17.9	21.4	28
13	55.6	27.8	11.1	18
14	100.0	62.5	25.0	8
15	54.2	16.7	25.0	24
16	37.5	6.3	37.5	16
17	53.9	23.1	38.5	13
18	73.3	20.0	46.7	15
19	0.0	0.0	25.0	4
20	0.0	0.0	0.0	2
21	62.5	31.3	43.8	16
22	11.1	0.0	33.3	9
23	40.0	20.0	0.0	5
24	42.4	6.1	12.1	33
25	33.3	16.7	50.0	6
26	44.4	22.2	11.1	9
27	36.4	18.2	18.2	11
28	50.0	14.3	42.9	14
29	21.4	7.1	35.7	14
30	55.6	33.3	66.7	9
31	64.7	29.4	29.4	17
32	47.4	10.5	52.6	19
33	25.0	0.0	0.0	4
34	100.0	50.0	100.0	2
35	20.0	0.0	80.0	5
36	66.7	23.8	23.8	21
37	58.3	33.3	58.3	12
38	23.1	7.7	30.8	13

Table 3

Food Management Program Placement Statistics

I.D.E.A. ID Number	Percent Total Employment	Percent Total Related Employment	Percent Total Education	Number of Respondents
1	81.3	37.5	12.5	16
2	78.6	35.7	7.1	14
3	63.6	22.7	27.3	22
4	58.3	33.3	8.3	12
5	8.3	0.0	0.0	12
6	50.0	50.0	50.0	2
7	75.0	50.0	75.0	4
8	71.4	57.1	28.6	7
9	73.3	26.7	33.3	15
10	9.1	0.0	36.4	11
11	100.0	33.3	0.0	6
12	70.8	37.5	20.8	24
13	81.8	81.8	18.2	11
14	69.4	28.6	30.6	49
15	33.3	16.7	0.0	6
16	64.5	35.5	48.4	31
17	0.0	0.0	0.0	2
18	41.7	25.0	27.8	36
19	76.5	64.7	41.2	17
20	43.2	16.2	24.3	37
21	33.3	33.3	33.3	3
22	69.7	45.5	57.6	33
23	31.8	13.6	59.1	22
24	33.3	0.0	0.0	3
25	60.0	40.0	40.0	10
26	68.2	36.4	40.9	22
27	50.0	33.3	8.3	12
28	40.0	30.0	25.0	20
29	30.0	0.0	30.0	10
30	63.6	18.2	27.3	11
31	36.4	18.2	63.6	11
32	50.0	25.0	25.0	4
33	50.0	50.0	100.0	2
34	80.0	80.0	20.0	5
35	63.6	36.4	45.5	11
36	72.7	27.3	63.6	11
37	55.6	33.3	33.3	9
38	62.5	25.0	37.5	24
39	50.0	25.0	37.5	8
40	42.9	14.3	57.1	7
41	54.1	35.1	35.1	37
42	76.9	69.2	7.7	13
43	58.3	37.5	33.3	24
44	18.2	9.1	27.3	11
45	100.0	0.0	33.3	3
46	17.7	5.9	23.5	17
47	92.9	35.7	42.9	14
48	70.0	45.0	25.0	20
49	15.0	15.0	5.0	20

Table 3 Continued

I.D.E.A. ID Number	Percent Total Employment	Percent Total Related Employment	Percent Total Education	Number of Respondents
50	53.3	40.0	26.7	15
51	25.0	0.0	25.0	4
52	62.5	31.3	18.8	16
53	60.0	40.0	60.0	10
54	42.1	15.8	79.0	19
55	55.6	33.3	11.1	9
56	73.3	50.0	13.3	30
57	85.7	50.0	28.6	14
58	33.3	0.0	0.0	3
59	68.2	40.9	13.6	22
60	50.0	20.0	80.0	10
61	72.2	38.9	38.9	18

Table 4

Clothing Management Program Placement Statistics

I.D.E.A. ID Number	Percent Total Employment	Percent Total Related Employment	Percent Total Education	Number of Respondents
1	20.0	0.0	20.0	5
2	25.0	0.0	16.7	12
3	39.4	18.2	66.7	33
4	50.0	0.0	25.0	4
5	25.0	25.0	50.0	4
6	12.5	0.0	75.0	8
7	54.6	27.3	63.6	11
8	75.0	0.0	25.0	4

Table 5

Comparison of Placement Rates Across Program Types

Program Type	Number of Programs	Total Employment				Total Related				Education			
		High	Low	Avg.	S.D.	High	Low	Avg.	S.D.	High	Low	Avg.	S.D.
Child Care	38	100.0	0.0	45.9	25.0	62.5	0.0	18.6	15.7	100.0	0.0	33.2	22.6
Clothing Management	8	75.0	12.5	37.7	21.1	27.3	0.0	8.8	12.4	75.0	16.7	42.8	23.7
Food Management	61	100.0	0.0	55.4	22.6	81.8	0.0	30.3	19.2	100.0	0.0	31.5	21.9

Table 6

Results of Regression Analysis for Food Management
Placement Rate: Total Employment

Regression Statistics

			Analysis of Variance	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F*
Multiple R	=	0.846					
R^2	=	0.715					
Adjusted R^2	=	0.590	Regression	18	21874.1	1215.2	5.71
Standard Error	=	14.585	Residual	41	8721.9	212.7	

*P < .05

Specific Items in the Equation (P <.05)

Related to High Placement:

1. MESC counselors played no role in student placement.
2. Administrators other than the vocational director are very positive toward the program.
3. All students receive vocational interest screening.

Related to Low Placement:

1. Follow-up information is very important for complying with reporting requirements.

Table 7

Results of Regression Analysis for Food Management
Placement Rate: Related Total

Regression Statistics

			Analysis of Variance	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F *
Multiple R	=	0.871					
R^2	=	0.759					
Adjusted R^2	=	0.676	Regression	13	16753.8	1288.8	9.20
Standard Error	=	11.836	Residual	38	5323.7	140.1	

*P< .05

Specific Items in the Equation (P< .05)

Related to High Placement:

1. Advisory committee played some role in placement.
2. Program assessment procedures are used for program evaluation at least yearly.
3. Adequate lab space is clearly available.

Related to Low Placement:

1. CETA counselors played some role in placement.
2. All students are provided information on what factors to consider in deciding whether to accept a job offer (salary, fringe, accessibility, opportunities for advancement, etc).
3. Relatives did not play a major role in placement.

Table 8

Results of Regression Analysis for Food Management Placement Rate: Education

Regression Statistics

			Analysis of Variance	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F*
Multiple R	=	0.919					
R^2	=	0.846					
Adjusted R^2	=	0.669	Regression	31	23505.6	758.24	4.78
Standard Error	=	12.601	Residual	27	4287.4	158.79	

*P <.05

Specific Items in the Equation (P <.05)

Related to High Placement:

1. Advisory committee played no role in placement of graduates.
2. CETA counselors played no role in placement.
3. MPO's other than Michigan were an important resource in curriculum development.
4. Catering is not an unpaid work experience.

Related to Low Placement:

1. Curriculum modified to meet the needs of handicapped students.
2. Using follow-up data are not very important for building a graduate data base.
3. Parents are not a major influence for students' decisions as to post graduate education or job attainment activities.
4. More than 50% of the students receive job bank services.

Table 9

Results of Regression Analysis for Child Care Placement Rate: Total Employment

Regression Statistics

Multiple R	=	0.947	Analysis of Variance	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F *
R^2	=	0.897					
Adjusted R^2	=	0.818	Regression	16	20680.3	1292.5	11.42
Standard Error	=	10.637	Residual	21	2376.0	113.1	

*P< .05

Specific Items in the Equation (P< .05)

Related to High Placement:

1. Students begin only at beginning of academic year.
2. An existing curriculum was not a very important resource in curriculum development.
3. Program assessment procedures are very important for program evaluation.
4. Program assessment procedures used for program evaluation are done at least yearly.
5. Guidance counselor is not a major influence in student decision-making regarding post graduate education or job attainment activities.

Related to Low Placement:

1. Transmitting knowledge about the world of work is a major program goal.

Table 10

Results of Regression Analysis for Child Care
Placement Rate: Related Total

Regression Statistics

Multiple R	= 0.949
R^2	= 0.900
Adjusted R^2	= 0.736
Standard Error	= 8.094

Analysis of Variance	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F*
Regression	23	8253.2	358.8	5.48
Residual	14	917.2	65.5	

*P <.05

Specific Items in the Equation (P <.05)

Related to High Placement:

1. Program assessment procedures are very important for program evaluation.
2. Placing students in jobs is not a major goal.

Related to Low Placement:

1. Co-op is a part of the program.
2. Special needs staff play a role in placement.
3. There is less than active promotion to guidance staff.
4. Placement staff play a major role in conducting the annual follow-up.

Table 11

Results of Regression Analysis for Child Care Placement Rate: Education

Regression Statistics

Multiple R	= 0.988
R^2	= 0.976
Adjusted R^2	= 0.937
Standard Error	= 5.687

*P <.05

Analysis of Variance	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F *
Regression	23	18503.9	804.5	24.88
Residual	14	452.7	32.3	

Specific Items in the Equation (P <.05)

Related to High Placement:

1. MESC counselors played no role in placement.
2. CETA counselors played no role in placement.
3. Students begin program at the beginning or end of year.
4. Not all students receive vocational interest screening.
5. Administration is very familiar with the job placement services and processes.

Related to Low Placement:

1. Placing students in jobs is the major goal of the program.

Table 12

Crosstabulation Analysis for Food Management
Placement Rate: Total Employment

Related to Low Placement

1. Program is not actively promoted to guidance staff.

2. Program assessment procedures are used for program evaluation less than yearly.

3. Student follow-up information is very important for complying with reporting requirements.

Table 13

Crosstabulation Analysis for Food Management
Placement Rate: Related Employment

Related to High Placement

1. Michigan MPO's did not serve as a very important resource in curriculum development.
2. Adequate storage is available.
3. Adequate lab space is clearly available.
4. There are clearly a sufficient number of equipment and tools.

Related to Low Placement

1. Vocational interest screening is not very important for students prior to enrollment.
2. At least 50% of the students receive job bank services.

Table 14

Crosstabulation Analysis for Child Care
Placement Rate: Total Employment

Related to High Placement

1. Less than 60 hours per year are devoted to unpaid work experience.
2. Less than 75% of the curriculum is specific to Child Care.
3. Academic year-end is very important in certifying that a student has completed the program.
4. Placing students in jobs is not a major goal of the program.

Related to Low Placement

1. Curriculum has not at all been modified to meet the requirements of L.E.P. students.

Table 15

Crosstabulation Analysis for Child Care
Placement Rate: Related Total

Related to High Placement

1. Less than 20 hours per year are spent in job shadowing.

2. Other teachers (other than program instructors) play no role in placement.

Related to Low Placement

1. Michigan MPO's are a very important resource in curriculum development.

2. Student follow-up is not very important for program modification.

Table 16

Crosstabulation Analysis for Child Care
Placement Rate: Education

Related to High Placement

1. Program assessment procedures are very important to reassess applicability of the program.

Table 17

Crosstabulation Analysis for Clothing Management
Placement Rate: Total Employment

Related to High Placement

1. At least two hours per week are spent with audio visuals(?)
2. The program is not promoted to specific organizations.
3. Michigan MPO's are a very important resource for curriculum development.
4. The advisory committee plays no role in reviewing new programs.
5. There is an adequate quantity of commercial type sewing machines.
6. The commercial type sewing machines fit the current technology.
7. Program assessment procedures are employed less than yearly for program modification.
8. Program assessment procedures are done less than yearly for assessment of job skills in need locally.
9. Vocational interest screening is very important for students prior to enrollment.
10. The facility clearly has adequate air circulation.
11. The facility clearly has adequate lighting.
12. The facility is clean.

Related to Low Placement

1. Follow-up information is very important for complying with reporting requirements.
2. Parents are very positive towards the program.
3. Program assessment procedures are very important for program modification.
4. Program assessment procedures are very important to reassess the applicability of the program.
5. Employers are very positive about the program.

Table 18

Crosstabulation Analysis for Clothing Management
Placement Rate: Related Total

Related to High Placement

1. Other teachers (other than program instructor) play a role in placement.
2. MESC counselors play no role in placement.
3. Michigan MPO's are a very important resource in curriculum development.
4. Mass production is a major focus of the program.
5. An existing curriculum is a very important resource in curriculum development.
6. Peers are a major influence for student decisions as to post graduate education and/or job attainment.

Related to Low Placement

1. Administrators other than the vocational director are very positive toward the program.
2. The community is very positive toward the program.
3. The teacher is a major influence on students decisions as to post graduation education and/or job attainment activities.

Table 19

Crosstabulation Analysis for Clothing Management
Placement Rate: Education

Related to High Placement

1. Other teachers (other than program instructor) play a role in placement.
2. Instructor has some role in annual state follow-up.
3. Follow-up information is very important to build a graduate data base.
4. Student is certified as completing program at the end of the academic year.
5. Curriculum has not at all been modified to meet the special requirements of disadvantaged students.
6. Upholstery techniques are not a focus of the program.
7. Students do not spend any time in a lab for draperies.
8. Adequate space is clearly available for small group instruction.

Related to Low Placement

1. Community is very positive towards the program.
2. Guidance staff is very positive towards the program.
3. Placement personnel are very positive towards the program.
4. Placement personnel have a major influence regarding students decisions as to post graduation education and/or job attainment activities.
5. Teacher is a major influence for students decisions as to both graduate education and/or job attainment.

Conclusions

Based upon the data analyses presented in the findings section of this report, several conclusions have been reached. These conclusions are presented below:

1. Many of the findings were specific to only one of the 3 programs. The data presented in the findings section of this report should be carefully reviewed to ascertain which of these findings are useful to individuals working with these specific programs.

2. A review of the findings revealed that several results need further investigation to clarify the exact nature of the results.

3. There were four findings which seemed to have application across the three programs. These are:
   a. Program assessment procedures should be used for program evaluation and enacted at least yearly.
   b. Multiple resources should be used in curriculum development.
   c. Promotional activities should be targeted to guidance counselors.
   d. Student follow-up should be used for program modification.

Recommendations

Based upon the experiences of the second project year as well as the result of this report, several recommendations are made for the third year of the project. These are:

1. Follow-up interview should be conducted with respondents to obtain further description of the study results identified as well as to clarify several of the findings from this year's study.

2. Those findings which were program specific should be made available to individuals from these programs. While these specific findings may not have applicability to other programs, it may be of interest for staff from the other programs to review these findings.

3. Based upon the experiences of two years of using the model developed to conduct this research, final modifications to the model should be made and the model should be put into written form.

Year 3 Activities

The purpose of this section of the report is to briefly identify those activities which will occur during the third project year. The impetus for these activities come from two sources: experiences during the previous two project years and findings presented in this report. The activities for Year 3 are presented below:

1. Dissemination of Year 2 study results to all appropriate audiences.

2. Provide technical assistance in the understanding of the research findings and implementation of findings to those individuals requesting such assistance.

3. Development of a resource guide which will identify specific types of activities which HERO Programs may engage in which have been linked to higher rates of placement. An example of such information would be types of promotional activities which may be used.

4. Provide incentive funds to several HERO Projects which will be used to implement recommendations based upon Year 2 study findings.

5. Conduct follow-up activities to those individuals contacted during Year 2 of the study to obtain additional information concerning variables of interest.

6. Monitor the progress of HERO Programs visited during the first year of the project to determine what changes, if any, have been made to the program based upon the results of this research.

7. Produce a model guidebook which may be used to implement this research in other program area settings. The model guidebook will completely describe the research process followed and will provide implementation steps to be used.

8. Provide a list of recommendations for further research in this area based upon the experience of the three project years.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

List of Programs Visited

HERO Visitations - 1981-82

83 - Food Management Production and Services

Site	Visitation Date
Ann Arbor - Pioneer High School	11-13-81
Armada High School	12-17-81
Auburn Heights - Avondale High School	11-24-81
Benton Harbor High School	12- 3-81
Branch Intermediate School District - Coldwater	11-30-81
Bridgeman High School	12- 2-81
Brighton High School	11-20-81
Buena Vista High School - Saginaw	1- 8-82
Calhoun Area Vocational Center - Battle Creek	12- 4-81
Charlevoix High School	11-18-81
Cherry Hill High School - Inkster	12-15-81
Chippewa Valley High School - Mt. Clemens	12-16-81
Corunna High School	12- 7-81
Davidson High School	11-17-81
Dearborn - Fordson High School	12-10-81
Detroit	
Central	2-25-82
Cody	2-26-82
Finney	3- 4-82
Kettering	3-10-82
MacKenzie	3- 3-82
Murray Wright	3- 5-82
Pershing	3- 1-82
Redford	3- 2-82
East Detroit High School	12-10-81
Eaton Intermediate School District - Lansing C.C.	11-24-81
Flat Rock - Riverview High School	11-24-81
Flint - Southwestern High School	11-16-81
Fraser High School	12- 8-81

Site	Visitation Date
Gaylord High School	11-16-82
Genessee Skill Center - Flint	2- -82
Grand Haven High School	12- 2-81
Grand Rapids - Creston High School	12- 9-81
Greenville High School	12- 9-81
Crosse Pointe	
North High School	2- 3-82
South High School	1-14-82
Hazel Park	1-14-82
Hazel Park High School	
Jardon Vocational Center	
Howell High School	11-19-81
Highland Park High School	12-15-81
Ingham Intermediate School District	
Capital Area Career Center	11-16-81
Mason	
L'Anse Creuse - Pankow Center - Mt. Clemens	1-18-82
Lansing	
Hill High School	11-17-81
Marquette High School	11-23-81
Marquette Intermediate School District	11-24-81
Westwood High School	
Ishpeming	
Mecosca Area Vocational Center	1- 6-82
Big Rapids	
Menominee High School	11-25-81
Muskegon High School	12- 3-81
Newaygo Area Vocational Center	12-10-81
Fremont	
Niles High School	12- 1-81
Northeast Oakland Vocational Center - Pontiac	11-23-81
Northwest Oakland Vocational Center - Clarkston	11-20-81

Site	Visitation Date
Oak Park High School	12- 4-81
Ottawa Vocational Center - Holland	12- 1-81
Paw Paw High School	12- 2-81
Petoskey Area Vocational Center - Petoskey	11-18-81
Plainwell High School	11-30-81
Plymouth-Salem High School - Plymouth	1- 7-82
Pontiac Central High School Northern High School	11-18-81
Portage - Central High School	12- 3-81
Rochester - Adams High School	12- 2-81
Roseville High School	1-28-82
Royal Oak - Dondero High School	12-11-81
Saginaw - Averill Career Center	11-20-81
Saline High School	11-23-81
Sanilac Career Center - Peck	11-23-81
Southfield High School	12- 4-81
Southeast Oakland Vocational Center - Royal Oak	12-11-81
Southwest Oakland Vocational Center - Wixom	1-14-82
St. Claire Shores - South Lake High School	12-14-81
St. Clair Vocational Center - Marysville	
Sturgis	1-19-82
Taylor High School	12- 9-81
Traverse Bay Vocational Center - Traverse City	1-17-81
Utica - Ford High School	1-13-82
Van Buren Skill Center - Lawrence	12- 2-81
Van Dyke - Lincoln High School	1-11-82

Site	Visitation Date
Walled Lake Central Western	1-12-82
Warren Woods - Tower High School	12- 8-81
Wayne-Westland Vocational Center - Wayne	1-12-82
Wexford-Missaukee Area Vocational Center - Cadillac	12-11-81
Wyoming - Rogers High School	11-18-81
Ypsilanti Career Center	1-12-82

HERO Visitations - 1981-82

51 - Child Care Services

Site	Visitation Date
Alma High School	1- 7-82
Benton Harbor High School	12- 3-81
Berkley High School - Pilot	11-10-81
Branch Intermediate School District - Coldwater	11-30-81
Brighton High School	11-20-81
Calhoun Area Vocational Center - Battle Creek	12- 4-81
Cherry Hill High School - Inkster	12-15-81
Davidson High School	
Detroit	
Cooley High School	2- 3-82
Finney High School	3- 4-82
Kettering High School	3-10-82
Murray Wright High School	3- 5-82
Eaton Intermediate School District - Lansing C.C.	11-24-81
Ferndale High School	12- 9-81
Flint - Flint Open School	11-13-81
Flint - Kearsley High School	12- 9-81
Grand Rapids - Grand Rapids Junior College	12- 9-81
Grosse Pointe - Barnes Elementary	2- 3-82
Ionia High School	12- 8-81
Howell - McPherson Elementary	11-19-81
Kalamazoo	12- 1-81
Central High School	
Loy Norrix High School	
L'Anse Creuse - Pankow Center - Mt. Clemens	1-18-82
Lansing - Everette High School	11-17-81
Marquette High School	11-23-81

Site	Visitation Date
Mecosta Intermediate School District - Big Rapids	1- 6-82
Montcalm Area Vocational Center - Stanton	12-10-81
Monroe High School	11-24-81
Mt. Clemens High School	1-15-82
Newaygo Vocational Center - Fremont	12-10-81
Northeast Oakland Vocational Center - Pontiac	3-25-82
Ottawa Vocational Center - Holland	12- 1-81
Plymouth-Canton High School	1 -[illegible]-82
Romulus High School	2-26-82
Saginaw - Averill Career Center	11-20-82
Saline High School	11-23-81
Sanilac Career Center - Peck	11-23-81
St. Clair	
Lakeview - Lakeshore	1-15-82
Greenwood Elementary	
Traverse Bay Vocational Center - Traverse City	1-17-81
Troy - Athens High School	11-12-81
Tuscola Area Skill Center - Caro	11-19-81
Utica	
Ford High School	1-13-82
Eisenhower High School	1-13-82
Van Buren Skill Center - Lawrence	12- 2-81
Walled Lake	1-12-82
Central	
Western	
Warren Woods - Tower High School	12- 8-81
Waterford - Mott High School	12-15-81
Waverly High School	2-23-82
Wayne-Westland Vocational Center - Wayne	1-12-82

Site	Visitation Date
Wexford-Missaukee Area Vocational Center - Cadillac	12-11-81
Ypsilanti Career Center	1-12-82

HERO Visitations - 1981-82

11 - Clothing Management/Production and Services

Site	Visitation Date
Detroit	
Cass Tech High School	2-25-82
Chadsey High School	2-23-82
Kettering High School	3-10-82
MacKenzie High School	3- 3-82
Murray Wright High School	3- 5-82
Northern High School	2-23-82
East Detroit High School	12-10-81
Ottawa Area Vocational Center - Holland	12- 9-81
Stephenson High School	11-24-81
Southeast Vocational Center - Royal Oak	12-11-81
Averill Career Center - Saginaw	11-20-81

APPENDIX B

Letter Sent to Site Directors

Instructional
Development
and
Evaluation
Associates Inc.

ERIC M. GORDON, Ph.D., Director
3011 W. Twelve Mile Road • Berkley, Michigan 48072 • (313) 541-1600

Dear

As per our telephone conversation, the purpose of this letter is to reiterate the information we discussed relative to the visitation of the Home Economics Related Occupations Program (HERO) located at your site. This study is being conducted under contract with the Michigan Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Education Service. The purpose of the study is to identify factors which affect the placement rates of students graduating from the Home Economics Related Occupations Programs and to identify different delivery systems used to deliver the program to students. It is important to emphasize that the purpose of this study is not to make a quality judgement about the programs at your site or the other 160 sites we are visiting.

We indicated during our phone conversation that the visit to your site is scheduled for _____. On this date, a staff member from Instructional Development and Evaluation Associates, Inc. will arrive at _____. The primary purpose of the visitation will be a series of interviews. We would greatly appreciate your scheduling the interviews for us. We need interviews scheduled with the following individuals: Vocational Director (yourself), Placement Director, and Program Instructor. The interview with yourself and the Placement Director should take approximately 20 minutes, while the interview with the Instructor will take approximately 45 minutes.

Let us take this opportunity to thank you for your cooperation. We realize that the on-site visitation will cause some inconvenience. However, we are certain that the information resulting from these site visitations will be beneficial not only to your program but to other HERO Programs around the state of Michigan as well. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us. If not, we will see you during the site visitation. Thank you again for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Marilyn E. Cerny
Field Coordinator

APPENDIX C

Programmatic Recommendations

Program: Food Management Placement Rate: Related Placement

1. The advisory committee should play some role in the placement process but not a major role.

2. CETA counselors should not have a role in placement.

3. Program assessment procedures should be used for program evaluation at least yearly.

4. Information regarding what factors to consider in deciding whether to accept a job offer (salary, fringe, accessibility, opportunities for advancement, etc.) should be available to students but not required for all students.

5. Adequate lab space should be available.

6. Michigan Minimum Performance Objectives may be used as a resource in curriculum development but should not be the most important resource.

7. Vocational interest screening should be at least somewhat important for students prior to enrollment.

8. Adequate storage space should be available.

9. Sufficient equipment and tools should be available.

Program: Food Management Placement Rate: Total Placement

1. MESC counselors should not play a role in student placement.

2. Administrators other than the vocational director should have positive attitudes toward the program.

3. All students should receive vocational interest screening.

4. The program should be actively promoted to guidance staff.

5. Program assessment procedures should be used for program evaluation at least yearly.

Program: Food Management Placement Rate: Education Placement

1. The advisory committee and CETA counselors should play no role in the placement of graduates.

2. Curriculum and minimum performance objectives other than Michigan should be used as a resource in curriculum development.

3. Follow-up data should be used for building a graduate data base.

Program: Child Care Placement Rate: Related Placement

1. Co-op should be a separate component and not part of the child care program.

2. Special needs staff are not the most valuable resource for placement.

3. It is important to have active promotion to guidance staff.

4. Program assessment procedures are very important for program evaluation.

5. Placement staff should not play a major role in conducting the annual follow-up.

6. Placing students in jobs should be a goal of the program but not the major goal.

7. Job shadowing is useful but should be kept to a minimum.

8. Teachers other than the program instructor should not be involved in placement.

9. Michigan Minimum Performance Objectives are not a very important resource in curriculum development.

10. Student follow-up should be a resource used for program modification, but not the only resource.

Program: Child Care Placement Rate: Total Placement

1. Students should begin the program only at the beginning of the academic year.

2. It is not very important to base the program curriculum on an existing curriculum.

3. Program assessment procedures are very important for program evaluation.

4. Program assessment procedures used for program evaluation should be done at least yearly.

5. Transmitting knowledge about the world of work may be a program goal, however, it should not be the major program goal.

6. Guidance counselors may be an influence in student decisions regarding post-graduate education or job attainment activities, however, they should not be the major influence.

7. Unpaid work experience should be part of the curriculum, but but should not be extensive.

8. The curriculum should include specific content information as well as information that will transfer to other content areas.

9. The end of the academic year should be considered important in certifying that a student has completed the program.

10. The curriculum should be modified to meet the requirements of limited English proficiency students.

11. Placing students in jobs should be a goal of the program but not the major goal.

Program: Child Care Placement Rate: Education Placement

1. MESC and CETA counselors should not be involved in the placement process.

2. Students should begin the program only at the beginning of the academic year.

3. Placing students in jobs should be a goal of the program but not the major goal.

4. Vocational interest screening should be available but not required of students.

5. Administrators should be very familiar with job placement services and processes.

6. Program assessment procedures are very important to reassess applicability of the program.

Program: Clothing Management Placement Rate: Related Placement

1. Two key resources in curriculum development should be Michigan Minimum Performance Objectives and existing curricula.

2. Mass production should be a major focus of the program.

3. The teacher may be an influence on a student's decision as to post-graduation education and/or job attainment activities but should not be a major influence.

Program: Clothing Management Placement Rate: Total Placement

1. Every week some time should be spent with audio-visual materials.

2. Specific organizations should not be the primary focus of promotional activities.

3. Michigan Minimum Performance Objectives should be used as a resource for curriculum development.

4. There should be an adequate quantity of commercial type sewing machines with the most current technology.

5. Vocational interest screening should be used for students prior to enrollment.

6. The facility should have adequate air circulation, adequate lighting, and should be clean.

Program: Clothing Management Placement Rate: Education

1. Other teachers should play a role in the placement process.

2. Instructors should have some role in the annual state follow-up.

3. Follow-up information should be used to build a graduate data base.

4. Adequate space should be clearly available for small group instruction.

Child Care - Percent Total Employment

Placement	PSN	Location
0.0	596	Battle Creek Schools, Calhoun Vocational Center
0.0	6784	Warren Woods Public Schools, Robert Tower High School
0.0	6816	Ferndale City School District, Ferndale High School
3.45	402	Benton Harbor Area Schools, Benton Harbor High School
11.11	6938	Walled Lake Schools, Central High School
20.00	11287	Grosse Pointe Schools, J. Barnes School
21.43	8444	Mecosta Intermediate School District, Career Center
23.08	11768	Tuscola Area Vocational Center
25.00	11065	Alma Public Schools, Alma High School
33.33	7251	Utica Community Schools, Henry Ford II High School
36.36	7940	Van Buren Intermediate School District, Van Buren Skill Center
37.50	999	Eaton Intermediate School District, Lansing Community College
37.50	5388	Ypsilanti Schools, Ypsilanti Regional Center
40.00	1312	Kearsley Community Schools, Kearsley High School
40.00	1828	Lansing Public Schools, Everett High School
40.00	6965	Waterford Mott High School
42.42	7204	Newaygo Intermediate School District, Vocational Center
44.44	7902	Sanilac Intermediate School District, Career Center
46.43	3440	Monroe Public Schools, Monroe High School
47.37	11035	Ottawa Intermediate School District, Vocational Center
50.00	8046	Lanse Creuse Schools, Pankow Career Center
53.85	5451	Saline Area Schools, Saline High School
54.17	4567	Saginaw City Schools, Career Opportunities Center
55.56	2442	Grand Rapids Schools, Ed Parks Schools
55.56	3565	Central Montcalm Public Schools, Montcalm Vocational Center
55.56	9186	Cherry Hill School District, Cherry Hill High School
58.33	11588	Traverse Bay Intermediate School District, Vocational Center
62.50	3111	Utica Schools, Dwight Eisenhower School
62.50	6826	Pontiac Schools, Northeast Oakland Vocational Center
64.71	9500	Bay Arenac Intermediate School District, Bay Arenac Skill Center

Placement	PSN	Location
66.67	44	Branch Intermediate School District
66.67	1366	Davison Community Schools, Davison High School
66.67	11514	Lakeview Public Schools, Greenwood Elementary
70.00	2728	Brighton Area Schools, Brighton High School
73.33	6132	Wayne Westland Schools, John Glen High School
77.38	3269	Marquette Schools, Marquette High School
100.00	11078	Ionia Schools, Ionia High School
100.00	3873	Berkley Schools, Berkley High School

Child Care - Percent Total Related Employment

Placement	PSN	Location
0.0	402	Benton Harbor Area Schools, Benton Harbor High School
0.0	596	Battle Creek Schools, Calhoun Vocational Center
0.0	1312	Kearsley Community Schools, Kearsley High School
0.0	6784	Warren Woods Public Schools, Robert Tower High School
0.0	6816	Ferndale City School District, Ferndale High School
0.0	6938	Walled Lake Schools, Central High School
0.0	11065	Alma Public Schools, Alma High School
0.0	11287	Grosse Pointe Schools, J. Barnes School
6.06	7204	Newaygo Intermediate School District, Vocational Center
6.25	3111	Utica Schools, Dwight Eisenhower School
6.25	5388	Ypsilanti Schools, Ypsilanti Regional Center
7.14	8444	Mecosta Intermediate School District, Career Center
7.69	11768	Tuscola Area Vocational Center
10.53	11035	Ottawa Intermediate School District, Vocational Center
14.29	8046	Lanse Creuse Schools, Pankow Career Center
16.67	44	Branch Intermediate School District
16.67	2442	Grand Rapids Schools, Ed Parks School
16.67	4567	Saginaw City Schools, Career Opportunities Center
16.67	7251	Utica Community Schools, Henry Ford II High School
17.86	3440	Monroe Public Schools, Monroe High School
18.18	7940	Van Buren Intermediate School District, Van Buren Skill Center
20.00	1828	Lansing Public Schools, Everett High School
20.00	6132	Wayne Westland Schools, John Glen High School
20.00	6965	Waterford Mott High School
22.22	7902	Sanilac Intermediate School District, Career Center
23.08	5451	Saline Area Schools, Saline High School
23.81	11514	Lakeview Public Schools, Greenwood Elementary
25.00	999	Eaton Intermediate School District, Lansing Community College
27.78	3565	Central Montclam Public School, Montcalm Vocational Center
29.41	9500	Bay Arenac Intermediate School District, Bay Arenac Skill Center
29.63	3269	Marquette Schools, Marquette High School

Placement	PSN	Location
31.65	6826	Pontiac Schools, Northeast Oakland Vocational Center
33.33	11588	Traverse Bay Intermediate School District, Vocational Center
33.33	9186	Cherry Hill School District, Cherry Hill High School
44.44	1366	Davison Community Schools, Davison High School
50.00	2728	Brighton Area Schools, Brighton High School
50.00	11078	Ionia Schools, Ionia High School
62.50	3873	Berkley Schools, Berkley High School

Child Care - Percent Total Education

Placement	PSN	Location
0.0	6965	Waterford School, Waterford Mott High School
0.0	6816	Ferndale City School District, Ferndale High School
0.0	11065	Alma Public Schools, Alma High School
6.67	1828	Lansing Public Schools, Everett High School
11.11	44	Branch Intermediate School District
11.11	3565	Central Montcalm Public Schools, Montcalm Vocational Center
11.11	7902	Sanilac Intermediate School District, Career Center
12.12	7204	Newaygo Intermediate School District, Vocational Center
13.79	402	Benton Harbor Area Schools, Benton Harbor High School
18.18	7940	Van Buren Intermediate School District, Van Buren Skill Center
18.75	999	Eaton Intermediate School District, Lansing Community College
20	1312	Kearsley Community Schools, Kearsley High School
21.43	3440	Monroe Public Schools, Monroe High School
22.22	1366	Davison Community Schools, Davison High School
23.81	11514	Lakeview Public Schools, Greenwood Elementary
25.00	6784	Warren Woods Public Schools, Robert S. Tower High School
25.00	3873	Berkley Schools, Berkley High School
25.00	4567	Saginaw City School District, Career Opportunities Center
29.41	9500	Bay Arenac Intermediate School District, Bay Arenac Skill Center
30.77	11768	Tuscola Intermediate School District, Area Vocational Center
33.33	6938	Walled Lake Schools, Central High School
35.71	8444	Mecosta Intermediate School District, Career Center
37.04	3269	Marquette Schools, Marquette High School
37.50	5388	Ypsilanti Schools, Ypsilanti Regional Center
38.46	5451	Saline Schools, Saline High School
40.00	2728	Brighton Area Schools, Brighton High School
42.86	8046	Lanse Creuse Schools, Pankow Career Center
43.75	6826	Pontiac Schools, Northeast Oakland Vocational Center

Placement	PSN	Location
46.67	6132	Wayne Westland Schools, John Glen High School
50.00	596	Battle Creek Schools, Calhoun Vocational Center
50.00	7251	Utica Community Schools, Henry Ford II High School
52.63	11035	Ottawa Intermediate School District, Vocational Center
58.33	11588	Traverse Bay Intermediate School District, Vocational Center
61.11	2442	Grand Rapids Schools, Ed Park School
62.50	3111	Utica Schools, Dwight Eisenhower School
66.67	9186	Cherry Hill School District, Cherry Hill High School
80.00	11287	Grosse Pointe Schools, J. Barne School
100.00	11078	Ionia Schools, Ionia High School

Food Management - Percent Total Education

Placement	PSN	Location
0.0	403	Benton Harbor Schools, Benton Harbor High School
0.0	2468	Wyoming Schools, Rogers High School
0.0	2853	Roseville Community Schools, Roseville High School
0.0	3270	Marquette City Schools, Marquette High School
0.0	3978	Hazel Park City Schools, Hazel Park High School
7.14	45	Branch Intermediate School District
7.69	7594	Marquette Alger Intermediate School District, Westwood High School
8.33	176	Plainwell Community Schools, Plainwell High School
8.33	4446	Gaylord Community Schools, Gaylord High School
12.50	27	Wexford Missaukee Intermediate School District, Vocational Center
18.18	2777	Howell Public Schools, McPherson Middle School
20.00	5898	Grosse Pointe Public Schools, Grosse Pointe North High School
20.83	2729	Brighton Area Schools, Brighton High School
23.53	7932	Van Buren Intermediate School District, Van Buren Skill Center
24.32	3610	Muskegon City Schools, Muskegon High School
25.00	4568	Saginaw City School District, Career Opportunities Center
25.00	5796	Cherry Hill School District, Cherry Hill High School
27.27	92	Newaygo Intermediate School District, Newaygo Area Vocational Center
27.27	7895	Sanilac Intermediate School District, Sanilac Career Center
27.78	3355	Menominee Area Public Schools, Menominee High School
28.57	597	Battlecreek Public Schools, Calhoun Vocational Center
30.00	4621	Buena Vista School District, Buena Vista High School
30.61	2833	East Detroit High School
33.33	1368	Davison Community Schools, Davison High School
33.33	3793	Pontiac City School District, Central High School
33.33	6786	Warren Woods Public Schools, Robert Tower High School
33.33	7712	St. Clair Intermediate School District, Skill Center
33.33	7923	Pontiac City School District, Northern High School
35.14	7316	Flint City Schools, Genesee Skill Center

Placement	PSN	Location
36.36	1890	Lansing Schools, Harry Hill High School
37.50	6828	Pontiac Schools, Northeast Oakland Vocational Center
37.50	6868	Avondale Schools, Avondale High School
40.00	4270	Walled Lake Consolidated Schools, Western High School
40.91	4279	Walled Lake Consolidated Schools, Southwest Oakland Vocational Center
41.18	3543	Greenville Public Schools, Greenville High School
45.45	6272	Flat Rock Community Schools, Riverview High School
48.39	2971	Fraser Public Schools, Fraser High School
50.00	496	Niles Community Schools, Niles Senior High School
57.14	7252	Utica Community School District, Henry Ford II High School
57.58	3857	Royal Oak Community School District, Southeast Oakland Vocational Center
59.09	3882	Southfield Schools, Southfield High School
63.64	5647	Mackenzie High School, Detroit
63.64	6725	South Lake Schools, South Lake High School
75.00	553	Bridgeman Public Schools, Bridgeman High School
100.00	5884	Grosse Pointe Schools, South High School

Food Management - Percent Total Employment

Placement	PSN	Location
0.0	3270	Marquette City School District, Marquette High School
8.33	403	Benton Harbor Schools, Benton Harbor High School
9.09	1890	Lansing Schools, Harry Hill High School
17.65	7932	Van Buren Intermediate School District, Van Buren Skill Center
18.18	7895	Sanilac Intermediate School District, Sanilac Career Center
30.00	4621	Buena Vista School District, Buena Vista High School
31.82	3882	Southfield Schools, Southfield High School
33.33	2853	Roseville Community Schools, Roseville High School
33.33	3793	Pontiac City School District, Central High School
33.33	3978	Hazel Park City Schools, Hazel Park High School
36.36	5647	Mackenzie High School, Detroit
40.00	4568	Saginaw City School District, Career Opportunities Center
41.67	3355	Menominee Area Public Schools, Menominee High School
42.86	7252	Utica Community Schools, Henry Ford II High School
43.24	3610	Muskegon City Schools, Muskegon High School
50.00	496	Niles Community School District, Niles Senior High School
50.00	4446	Gaylord Community Schools, Gaylord High School
50.00	5796	Cherry Hill School District, Cherry Hill High School
50.00	5884	Grosse Pointe Schools, South High School
50.00	6868	Avondale Schools, Avondale High School
54.05	7316	Flint City Schools, Genesee Skill Center
55.56	6786	Warren Woods Public Schools, Robert Tower High School
58.33	176	Plainview Community Schools, Plainview High School
58.33	7712	St. Clair Intermediate School District, Skill Center
60.00	4270	Walled Lake Consolidated Schools, Western High School
62.50	6828	Pontiac Schools, Northeast Oakland Vocational Center
63.64	92	Newaygo Intermediate School District, Newaygo Vocational Center
63.64	5452	Saline Area School District, Saline High School
63.64	6272	Flat Rock Community Schools, Riverview High School
64.52	2971	Fraser Public Schools, Fraser High School
68.18	4279	Walled Lake Consolidated Schools, Southwest Oakland Vocational Center

Placement	PSN	Location
69.39	2833	East Detroit High School
69.70	3857	Royal Oak City School District, Southeast Oakland Vocational Center
70.83	2729	Brighton Area Schools, Brighton High School
71.43	597	Battlecreek Public Schools, Calhoun Vocational Center
72.73	6725	South Lake Schools, South Lake High School
73.33	1368	Davison Community Schools, Davison High School
75.00	553	Bridgeman Public Schools, Bridgeman High School
76.47	3543	Greenville Public Schools, Greenville High School
76.92	7594	Marquette Alger Intermediate School District, Westwood High School
78.57	45	Branch Intermediate School District
80.00	5898	Grosse Pointe Public Schools, Grosse Pointe North High School
81.25	27	Wexford Missaukee Intermediate School District, Vocational Center
81.82	2777	Howell Public Schools, McPherson Middle School
100.00	2468	Wyoming Public Schools, Roger High School
100.00	7923	Pontiac City School District, Northern High School

Food Management - Total Related Employment

Placement	PSN	Location
0.0	403	Benton Harbor Schools, Benton Harbor High School
0.0	1890	Lansing Schools, Harry Hill High School
0.0	3270	Marquette City School District, Marquette Senior High School
0.0	3978	Hazel Park City Schools, Hazel Park High School
0.0	4621	Buena Vista School District, Buena Vista High School
0.0	7923	Pontiac City School District, Northern High School
5.88	7932	Van Buren Intermediate School District, Van Buren Skill Center
9.09	7895	Sanilac Intermediate School District, Sanilac Career Center
13.64	3882	Southfield Schools, Southfield High School
14.29	7252	Utica Community Schools, Henry Ford II High School
16.22	3610	Muskegon City Schools, Muskegon High School
16.67	2853	Roseville Community Schools, Roseville High School
18.18	5452	Saline Area School District, Saline High School
18.18	5647	MacKenzie High School, Detroit
22.73	92	Newaygo Intermediate School District, Newaygo Vocational Center
25.00	3355	Menominee Area Public Schools, Menominee High School
25.00	5796	Cherry Hill School District, Cherry Hill High School
25.00	6828	Pontiac Schools, Northeast Oakland Vocational Center
25.00	6868	Avondale Schools, Avondale High School
26.67	1368	Davison Community Schools, Davison High School
27.27	6725	Southlake Schools, Southlake High School
28.57	2833	East Detroit High School
30.00	4568	Saginaw City School District, Career Opportunities Center
33.33	176	Plainview Community Schools, Plainview High School
33.33	2468	Wyoming Schools, Rogers High School
33.33	3793	Pontiac City School District, Central High School
33.33	4446	Gaylord Community Schools, Gaylord High School
33.33	6786	Warren Woods Public Schools, Robert Tower High School
35.14	7316	Flint City Schools, Genesee Skill Center
35.48	2971	Fraser Public Schools, Fraser High School

Placement	PSN	Location
35.71	45	Branch Intermediate School District
36.36	4279	Walled Lake Consolidated Schools, Southwest Oakland Vocational Center
36.36	6272	Flat Rock Community Schools, Riverview High School
37.50	27	Wexford Missaukee Intermediate School District, Vocational Center
37.50	2729	Brighton Area Schools, Brighton High School
37.50	7712	St. Clair Intermediate School District, Skill Center
40.00	4270	Walled Lake Consolidated Schools, Western High School
45.45	3857	Royal Oak City School District, Southeast Oakland Vocational Center
50.00	496	Niles Community School District, Niles Senior High School
50.00	553	Bridgeman Public Schools, Bridgeman High School
50.00	5884	Grosse Pointe Schools, Smith High School
57.14	597	Battle Creek Public Schools, Calhoun Vocational Center
64.71	3543	Greenville Public Schools, Greenville High School
69.23	7594	Marquette Alger Intermediate School District, Westwood High School
80.00	5898	Grosse Pointe Public Schools, Grosse Pointe North High School
81.82	2777	Howell Public Schools, McPherson Middle School

Clothing Management - Total Education

Placement	PSN	Location
16.67	4566	Saginaw City School District, Career Opportunities Center
20.00	3373	Stephenson Area Public Schools, Stephenson High School
25.00	5532	Detroit, Chadsey High School
25.00	11036	Ottawa Intermediate School District, Vocational Center
50.00	5679	Detroit, Northern High School
63.64	6847	Royal Oak City Schools, Southwest Oakland Vocational Center
66.67	5498	Cass Technical High School, Detroit
75.00	5737	Detroit, Murray Wright High School

Clothing Management - Percent Total Employment

Placement	PSN	Location
12.50	5737	Detroit, Murray Wright High School
20.00	3373	Stephenson Area Public Schools, Stephenson High School
25.00	4566	Saginaw City School District, Career Opportunities Center
25.00	5679	Detroit, Northern High School
39.39	5498	Detroit, Cass Technical High School
50.00	5532	Detroit, Chadsey High School
54.55	6847	Royal Oak City Schools, Southeast Oakland Vocational Center
75.00	11036	Ottawa Intermediate School District, Skill Center

Clothing Management - Total Related Employment

Placement	PSN	Location
0.0	3373	Stephenson Area Public Schools, Stephenson High School
0.0	4566	Saginaw City Schools, Career Opportunities Center
0.0	5532	Detroit, Chadsey High School
0.0	5737	Detroit, Murray Wright High School
0.0	11036	Ottawa Intermediate School District, Vocational Center
18.18	5498	Detroit Schools, Cass Technical High School
25.00	5679	Detroit Schools, Northern High School
27.27	6847	Royal Oak City Schools, Southeast Oakland Vocational Center